SCDC Meeting 2018-07-09

Attendees: Diana Carney (Alliance); Beth Denker (Alliance); Katy DiVittorio (Aur); Rhonda Glazier (UCCS); Jeff Grossman (CMU); Gregory Heald (UNC); Sandy Hudock (CSU-P); Yumin Jiang (HSC); Stephen Katz (Mines); Kayla Lenkner (CC); Dave Macauley (UW); George Machovec (Alliance); Ellen Metter (Aur); Cairie Riney (Regis); Anna Siefert (Mines); Shannon Tharp (DU); Gabby Wiersma (CUB); Tiffanie Wick (WSCU); Michelle Wilde (CSU)

1. Gabby W. opened a discussion about the video streaming survey that was sent to member libraries. There is an assumption that libraries are working on video content collection development. The survey seeks to determine what member libraries are currently working on, which vendors are available to work with and what users are asking for.

Preliminary results: Beth D said that she has received some responses and would like to receive more for a more comprehensive view. She will send out emails to those not heard from. The main thing she has noticed is that there is some interest around access to mainstream films and that there doesn’t seem to be a way to provide this. She hopes to have more responses in the next couple of weeks to determine if there is a need among member libraries for more video content thru the Alliance.

There was also a member council request to look at the Academic Video Trust Online with the aim of seeing what this model looks like. This project centers on preservation of and copyright permission for owned VHS content.

1. UPSO ebook contract: Beth D. said that eight member libraries are ready to go with this purchase but, given that the proposal under consideration is relatively old and is offering older content and pricing, she needs feedback on which uploads are desired. The proposal offers 2017 and 2018 uploads. She mentioned that a similar upload schedule for OSO may be desirable: Sept 2018, Jan 2019 and May 2019. Gabby W. thought that would be reasonable. Kayla L. agreed that these dates would work for CC. Beth D. will negotiate a similar deal as the original proposal with updated content and will use assessment model for pricing.

On a related note, Beth D. has just received OSO pricing and will work with the Oxford rep on sending out a proposal in the near future.

1. Elsevier e-books: Beth D. talked to Kelly at Elsevier about pricing after receiving Alliance feedback on the Elsevier e-book proposal. Elsevier has sent an amended proposal to sweeten the deal. In addition to perpetual access for the 2019 and 2020 front list, Elsevier is proposing all access to an additional 23,600 titles for $75,000 each year from participating libraries. This content would include older monographs, book series, reference works, and textbooks. It is important to note that this additional content would not be owned in perpetuity.

Greg H. mentioned that the content is not that compelling and that UNC has a greater interest in MRWs. Rhonda G. wondered how many titles are published in the 2019/2020 front list. The 2017 title list was 1335 titles. Michelle W. mentioned that these e-books get heavy usage at CSU and that they are very interested in this deal. Anna S. said that Mines is also interested in the deal as is. George M. mentioned that other deal configurations are possible, but the cost would obviously be less if all subscribing libraries participated. Beth D. said she would do some cost modelling on different configurations.

1. Springer e-book offer: Beth D said there is no firm pricing yet, but the Springer rep has shared some information regarding series gaps for participating libraries. There was also some preliminary pricing information but, ultimately, the price is up for negotiation. She asked that member libraries take a look at this information and see if it is correct and to let her know if they are interested in filling the gaps in their Springer e-book collections. There is a new subject module called Intelligent Computing and Robotics.

Gabby W. mentioned that she had been in touch with the rep. regarding gaps, as CU would like to complete their collection, but feels the cost is too great.

Beth D. said she would run comparison reports for the Springer rep. and all subscribing libraries for an updated and comprehensive view of owned titles and gaps. Gabby W. also wondered where the 2018 spend data on the spreadsheet had come from. Beth D. said she would find out from the Springer rep.

1. Open Textbook Network membership: George M. discussed this at Member Council and said that, while the Council has some interest, it would wait to see what the statewide OER Council would make available in terms of funding. As it stands, the OER Council is making $500,000 in grant money available to public institutions via RFP. The Alliance will send out the RFP on the SCDC listserv when it becomes available. The turnaround time for submitting the RFP to the OER Council is two weeks and other campus groups can apply. The maximum grant will be $99,000. As the Alliance is not a public institution and there are non-public institutions in the Alliance, it is not possible for the Alliance to submit a grant proposal for statewide consortium membership to the Open Textbook Network.
2. NewsBank’s Denver Post Annual Archive (microform discontinued). Ellen M. mentioned that the annual Denver Post microform archive is being discontinued and that a digitized version is being offered to them. In the past, this product has not been purchased through the Alliance, but she wanted to know what others are thinking/doing about this. Katy D. mentioned that an image archive is also available for an extra cost.

Many libraries get access to current content via World Access Online, but are confused about this new development regarding archival access. Some issues include CU having already paid for the 2019 microfilm, the fact that the archive is in high demand by in-house users and through ILL, and the uncertainty of perpetual access to this content.

1. SuDocs call number range Goldrush comparison demo: George M. provided a Goldrush demo of SuDoc call number ranges to compare uniqueness and overlap of government documents between one or more libraries. This service will be especially useful for weeding government documents by comparing member collections to a regional repository collection. Goldrush now has indexed SuDoc call numbers that users can narrow to call number ranges to export data and compare content. He is consulting with GOPIG member experts to discuss how deeply call numbers need to be indexed, as indexing down to the last digit really slows down the Goldrush system. The tool uses the same matching algorithm as the monograph comparison tool, and works well if the comparison libraries are using the same cataloging source for government documents. While not a perfect tool, it provides a first pass on matching and uniqueness.
2. Gabby W. proposed that the October meeting take place in-person at the Alliance office. She mentioned that there is a desire to build community and discuss how meetings could be more meaningful. She requested that SCDC member send agenda items that would be good for this in-person meeting.

Rhonda G. suggested a discussion about last copy and shared print as UCCS is in the midst of a large weeding project and would like to know what other members are thinking/doing in this area. George M. requested that participants send their ideas to Gabby, Michael, Beth or him.

1. Beth D. discussed new offers and renewals. She is wrapping up Sept. 1 renewals, but is still waiting on a few responses. She is also working on Sept. 30 renewals. EBSCO pricing will be sent out soon and there is not much going on in the way of new offers. She will continue to send out new offer information as she receives it from vendors/publishers.